

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending patent application is requested.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination and indication that claims 13 and 20 would be allowable if they are rewritten to include the limitations in their independent claims and any intervening claims.

Applicant has canceled claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11, 12, and 14-19, without prejudice.

Objection to claims 13, 20, and 21

To place claims 13 and 20 in condition for allowance, as indicated by the Examiner, Applicant has re-written claims 13 and 20 by incorporating the limitations in their independent claims. Allowance of claims 13 and 20 is respectfully requested.

Also, in response to the Examiner's objection of claim 21 as being a duplicate of claim 13, Applicant respectfully points out that claim 13 recites, at the second to the last line, that "...upright supports of said deck each have a top notch defining a horizontal seat..." whereas claim 21 recites, at the second to the last line, "...said upright supports of said deck each has a top defining a horizontal seat..."

Therefore, claim 21 is not a duplicate of claim 13 and should be patentable under the same reasoning as claim 13. Allowance of claim 21 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 4 under Sec. 103 (a)

Claim 4 was previously indicated by the Examiner as "Allowable Subject Matter" in the Office Action dated 8/3/2004. However, in the current Final Office Action, claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC Sec. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Mardis and Gagnon. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and requests that the allowability be re-instated.

Claim 4 recites, among others, a computer case, at least one electric fan mounted, a deck adapted to support the computer case, wherein the deck has a flat base plate, and a plurality of upright supports with each upright support having a top notch defining a

horizontal seat adapted to support the bottom panel of the computer case. (*emphasis added*) Neither Mardis, nor Gagnon, discloses the limitations as recited in claim 4, especially when it involves the upright support with a top notch defining a horizontal seat for support. (*emphasis added*) Therefore, the Sec. 103 rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn because a prima facie case has not been established by the Examiner.


Applicant has re-written claim 4 as an independent claim, which is now allowable in light of the above argument.

Conclusion

In light of the above discussion, Applicant respectfully requests that the allowance for claims 4, 13, 20 and 21 be granted at the earliest opportunity.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter relating the prosecution of the subject application.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 
Philip K. Yu, Customer Number **30781**

Please direct all future correspondence to:

Philip K. Yu, Customer Number **30781**
20955 Pathfinder Road, Ste. 100
Diamond Bar, CA 91765
626-965-1202

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class mail in an envelop addressed to MS AF, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this date:

12-6-2004

By 
Philip K. Yu, Reg. No. 35,742